



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/533,577	12/09/2005	Noel William Lovisa	340512-900306	4467
73230 7590 07/06/2009 DLA PIPER US LLP 1999 AVENUE OF THE STARS SUITE 400 LOS ANGELES, CA 90067-6023				
EXAMINER LINDSEY, MATTHEW S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2451				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/06/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/533,577

Applicant(s)

LOVISA, NOEL WILLIAM

Examiner

MATTHEW S. LINDSEY

Art Unit

2451

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 April 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25, 27-32, 35-39, 42-44 and 47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25, 27-32, 35-39, 42-44 and 47 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-25, 27-32, 35-39, 42-44 and 47 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 12, 14-15, 21, 24, 27, 31-32, 35, 39, 42 and 44 are amended; and Claim 47 is new, as filed on 9 April 2009.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1-20, 22-25, 27-30, 32, 35-39, 42-44 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanagan (US 2001/0056362) in view of Gangopadhyay (US 6,973,638).**

4. With respect to Claim 1, Hanagan disclosed: "A method of allowing a user to obtain a service using a processing system (Abstract, lines 1-3), the method utilising components each component corresponding to a respective service portion provided by a respective entity ([0087], lines 1-5), the method including causing the processing system to:

a) Determine a combination of components in accordance with input commands received from the user, the defined component combination defining a sequence of service portions ([0081], lines 3-9, where the OP accepts work requests and determines the combination of resources needed to complete the request) and one or more interconnections between at least some of the components defining transfer of data between the entities of the respective components ([0054], lines 4-8, where components are modular and can integrated into a system where they work together and [0087], lines 1-13, where data transfer between components is defined); and,

b) Implement the components in accordance with the component combination ([0081], lines 16-26, where for example, a customer orders call waiting, and the OP activates the service automatically by contacting the network element), wherein a service request is transferred to each entity requesting the respective service portion to be performed ([0081], lines 16-23, where a customer purchases a new phone line or call waiting and the OP translates the purchase into a request and [0081], lines 16-23, where the OP transfers the request to the network elements), wherein each service request includes an indication of the interconnections of the respective component ([0089], lines 3-8, Fig. 2, and [0090], lines 1-3, where the service request is for a replacement rating, billing engine in order to interface with the clients existing systems for customer care, financials management, order processing and network access. The request includes information on interfacing the new components with legacy components [0090], lines 3-18, or indication of the interconnections for the respective components), thereby causing the sequence of service portions to be performed, such

that the desired service is performed ([0081], lines 16-26, where for example, a customer orders call waiting, and the OP activates the service automatically by contacting the network element)").

Hanagan did not explicitly state: "one or more user defined interconnections".

However, Gangopadhyay disclosed: "one or more user to defined interconnections (Col. 2, lines 15-23 and Fig 3)".

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to combine Hanagan and Gangopadhyay since Hanagan disclosed teachings related to providing a user definable service. Gangopadhyay disclosed a method for a user to define a service.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the customer care and billing system of Hanagan with the teachings of Gangopadhyay to include support for user defined interconnections of components. Motivation to combine these references comes preserving modularity, by allowing a user to define connections and keep existing components when desired (for example see Hanagan, [0089], lines 3-8). Therefore, by combining the references, a user can choose to keep satisfactory components and define the interconnections between legacy components and new components as desired.

5. With respect to Claim 2, the combination of Hanagan and Gangopadhyay disclosed: "A method according to claim 1, the processing system including a base station coupled to one or more end stations via a communications network (Hanagan, [0181], lines 1-3, where the base station is the CCM, the end stations are the kiosks or remote access users), the method including allowing the user to use the end station to:
- a) Select one or more of the components (Hanagan, [0181], lines 10-13, where adding a new product or service in a GUI includes selecting the product or service); and, b)
- Define a component combination using the selected components (Hanagan, [0181], lines 10-16, where selecting different combinations of services defines a combination)".
6. With respect to Claim 3, the combination of Hanagan and Gangopadhyay disclosed: "A method according to claim 2, the method including causing the base station to:
- a) Receive a component request from the end station (Hanagan, [0181], lines 11-13, where a user adding a new product or service is a request); b) Transfer an indication of one or more components to the end station in accordance with the request (Hanagan, [0110], lines 6-14, where a user selects wireless service only and details of the wireless component must be transferred in order for the user to see only wireless products available to residential customers in a specific region), thereby allowing the user to select one or more of the components (Hanagan, [0181], lines 1-3 and 10-16, and Fig. 12, where a remote user can select components)".

7. With respect to Claim 4, the combination of Hanagan and Gangopadhyay disclosed: "A method according to claim 3, the method including causing the base station to: a) Receive a component selection from the end station (Hanagan, [0181], lines 11-13, where a user adding a new product or service is a selection), the component selection indicating one or more selected components (Hanagan, [0181], lines 11-13, where a user adding a new product or service is indicating the new product or service); and, b) Transfer details of the selected components to the end station in response to the request (Hanagan, [0110], lines 6-14, where a user selects wireless service only and details of the wireless component must be transferred in order for the user to see only wireless products available to residential customers in a specific region), thereby allowing the user to define the component combination (Hanagan, [0110], lines 6-14 and Fig 12, where wireless service is requested and the user can select certain combinations such as voice, data, caller ID, peak minutes etc)".

8. With respect to Claim 5, the combination of Hanagan and Gangopadhyay disclosed: "A method according to claim 2, the base station including a store for storing component specifications representing the service portion provided by a respective component and (Hanagan, [0182], lines 3-5), a processor (Hanagan, [0411], lines 8-10, where a CPU runs processes), the method including causing the processor to: a) Access the component specifications stored in the store (Hanagan, [0186], lines 1-4, where providing a catalog of the items is accessing the specifications stored by the PSM); and, b) Provide an indication of the services provided by the components to the

end station (Hanagan, Fig. 12, and [0181], lines 10-13), thereby allowing the user to select respective ones of the components (Hanagan, Fig. 12, and [0181], lines 10-13, where a user can select a new product or service)".

9. With respect to Claim 6, the combination of Hanagan and Gangopadhyay disclosed: "A method according to claim 5, at least some of the components including one or more ports (Hanagan, [0087], lines 8-12), the store being further adapted to store port specifications (Hanagan, [0182], lines 3-5, where the PSM stores product and service reference data, and [0185], lines 6-9, where service definitions includes association rules between the new service and existing services), each port specification indicating any information to be received by or output from the port (Hanagan, [0087], lines 8-12, where all information that is needed by the sending and receiving system is included), the method including causing the processor to: a) Access the port specifications stored in the store (Hanagan, [0186], lines 1-4, where the PSM provides the catalog to other applications, and therefore accesses the catalog, which has the service information including association rules or port specifications); and, b) Provide an indication of the information to the end station, thereby allowing the user to select the components (Hanagan, [0186], lines 1-4, where the PSM provides the catalog to customers so the customer can choose a service or product when making a purchase)".

10. With respect to Claim 7, the combination of Hanagan and Gangopadhyay disclosed: "A method according to claim 6, the method including allowing the user to define the component combination by connecting the ports of the selected components using the end station (Gangopadhyay, Col. 2, lines 15-23 and Fig 3)".

The reason to combine the references is the same as indicated above in claim 1.

11. With respect to Claim 8, the combination of Hanagan and Gangopadhyay disclosed: "A method according to claim 7, the method including connecting the ports in accordance with the port information defined in the port specifications (Hanagan, [0185], lines 6-9, where association rules are defined for a service for interfacing with existing services)".

12. With respect to Claim 9, the combination of Hanagan and Gangopadhyay disclosed: "A method according to claim 4, the method including causing the base station and/or the end station to: a) Generate a graphical representation of the selected components (Hanagan, [0110], lines 1-8); and, b) Manipulate the graphical representation in response to input commands received from the user to thereby define the component combination (Gangopadhyay, Col. 2, lines 17-23)".

The reason to combine the references is the same as indicated above in claim 1.

13. With respect to Claim 10, the combination of Hanagan and Gangopadhyay disclosed: "A method according to claim 9, the method further including causing the

base station to: a) Obtain a graphical representation of the selected components (Hanagan, [0110], lines 1-8); b) Transfer the graphical representations to the end station (Hanagan, [0181], lines 1-4, where the end stations are the kiosk or remote access users, the information of the services and products, including graphical representation, must be transferred to the remote access users in order to function)".

14. With respect to Claim 11, the combination of Hanagan and Gangopadhyay disclosed: "A method according to claim 10, the method including causing the base station and end station to implement the combined components in accordance with the generated graphical representation (Gangopadhyay, Col. 2, lines 24-36, where the graphical representation is used to create executable computer code to implement the process of the graphical representation)".

The reason to combine the references is the same as indicated above in claim 1.

15. With respect to Claim 12, the combination of Hanagan and Gangopadhyay disclosed: "A method according to claim 2, the components being implemented by component processing systems (Hanagan, [0081], lines 3-9, where components are implemented by component processing systems required to fulfill the request), the method of implementing the combined components including: a) Generating the service request for each component in the component combination (Hanagan, [0081], lines 16-23, where a customer purchases a new phone line or call waiting and the OP translates the purchase into a request); and, b) Transferring the service request to each entity via

the communications network (Hanagan, [0081], lines 16-23, where the OP transfers the request to the network elements), each entity being adapted to respond to the service request to implement the data manipulation embodied by the respective component (Hanagan, [0081], lines 23-26, where the network element fulfills the request and responds with a success to the OP)".

16. With respect to Claim 13, the combination of Hanagan and Ganagopadhyay disclosed: "A method according to claim 12, the method including: Determining any information required by the components (Hanagan, [0081], lines 3-9, where the OP determines the tasks required to complete the task and the type of resources required for each task); and, Providing the information in the service request (Hanagan, [0081], lines 16-23, where the OP determined the network element and translates the request to a low level activation request for the network element)".

17. With respect to Claim 14, the combination of Hanagan and Ganagopadhyay disclosed: "A method according to claim 12, wherein at least some of the components include one or more ports for receiving or outputting data ([0054], lines 4-6), wherein each service request including an indication of the interconnections for each of the ports of the respective component ([0089], lines 3-8, Fig. 2, and [0090], lines 1-3, where the service request is for a replacement rating, billing engine in order to interface with the clients existing systems for customer care, financials management, order processing and network access. The request includes information on interfacing the new

components with legacy components [0090], lines 3-18, or indication of the interconnections for the respective components)".

18. With respect to Claim 15, the combination of Hanagan and Ganagopadhyay disclosed: "A method according to claim 14, the method including causing each component processing system to: a) Implement one or more respective component instances in accordance with the received service request (Hanagan, [0089], line 3 – [0090], line 3, where a client requests certain components, and these are implemented in the existing legacy system); and, b) Cause each component instance to: i) Interact with other components in accordance with the interconnections defined in the service request (Hanagan, [0090], lines 3-18, where the various legacy components and the new components interact according to the service request); and, ii) Perform any required information manipulations (Hanagan, [0090], lines 3-18, where the legacy components and new components communicate via standardized interfaces)".

19. With respect to Claim 16, the combination of Hanagan and Ganagopadhyay disclosed: "A method according to claim 14, the method including causing each component processing system to: a) Implement a respective agent associated with each port (Hanagan, [0090], lines 3-18, where the components use standardized interfaces, or agents); and, b) Cause each agent to cooperate with an agent of another component in accordance with the defined interconnections, to thereby allow data to be transferred between the ports (Hanagan, [0090], lines 14-18, where the standardized

interfaces between components, or agents, allow data such as billed charges and invoice formats to be transferred between components and therefore the standardized interfaces of different components cooperate)".

20. With respect to Claim 17, the combination of Hanagan and Ganagopadhyay disclosed: "A method according to claim 1, at least some of the services being adapted to manipulate information (Hanagan, [0081], lines 16-23, where the service request requires the request be translated into a low level network activation request for a network element, or the service request requires information to be manipulated), the entity being adapted to perform the service by: a) Receiving the information to be manipulated at a ports (Hanagan, [0081], lines 16-18, where the OP receives a request from the CCM); b) Perform the manipulation (Hanagan, [0081], lines 21-23, where the OP translates the request to low level activation request); and, c) Provide the manipulated information at one of the ports (Hanagan, [0081], lines 21-23, where the translated request is transferred to the network element)".

21. With respect to Claim 18, the combination of Hanagan and Ganagopadhyay disclosed: "A method according to claim 17, the method including transferring the manipulated information to one or more components in accordance with the defined component combination (Hanagan, [0081], lines 21-23, where the OP transfers the manipulated information, the translated service request, to the network element in accordance with the service requested, i.e. call waiting)".

22. With respect to Claim 19, the combination of Hanagan and Ganagopadhyay disclosed: "A method according to claim 1, the method including causing the base station to: a) Determine performance information, the performance information being representative of one or more criteria regarding the implementation of the components by the respective entities (Hanagan, [0196], lines 16-21, where pricing information is determined); b) Provide the performance information to the user, the user selecting the components in accordance with the performance information (Hanagan, [0196], lines 16-21, where pricing information can be retrieved by the CCM to answer customer inquires)".

23. With respect to Claim 20, the combination of Hanagan and Ganagopadhyay disclosed: "A method according to claim 19, the performance information including at least one of: a) An indication of the entity implementing the component; b) An indication of the geographical location of the entity; c) An indication of the duration for implementing the component; d) An indication of a cost associated with implementing the respective component; and, e) A rating, the rating being indicative of the success of the component (Hanagan, [0196], lines 16-21, where performance information can include pricing information, or final pricing of events)".

24. With respect to Claim 22, the combination of Hanagan and Ganagopadhyay disclosed: "A method according to claim 1, the method including generating revenue by

charging a fee for the use of each component (Hanagan, [0050], lines 9-11, where a bill is created for the services used by the customer)".

25. With respect to Claim 23, the combination of Hanagan and Ganagopadhyay disclosed: "A method according to claim 22, the method including: a) Providing at least some of the revenue to the entity implementing the respective component; and, b) Having an operator of the base station retain at least some of the revenue (Hanagan, [0050], lines 1-11, where the operator of the base station is the telecommunications provider which implements the components, and the revenue generated from the bill will be provided to the telecommunications provider)".

26. With respect to Claim 24, Hanagan disclosed: "A system for allowing a user to obtain a service (Abstract, lines 1-3), the service being implemented using components, each component corresponding to a respective service portion provided by a respective entity ([0087], lines 1-5), the system including a processing system adapted to:

a) Determine a combination of components in accordance with input commands received from the user, the defined component combination defining a sequence of service portions ([0081], lines 3-9, where the OP accepts work requests and determines the combination of resources needed to complete the request) and one or more interconnections between at least some of the components defining transfer of data between the entities of the respective components ([0054], lines 4-8, where components

are modular and can be integrated into a system where they work together and ([0087], lines 1-13, where data transfer between components is defined); and,

b) Implement the components in accordance with the component combination ([0081], lines 16-26, where for example, a customer orders call waiting, and the OP activates the service automatically by contacting the network element), wherein a service request is transferred to each entity requesting the respective service portion to be performed ([0081], lines 16-23, where a customer purchases a new phone line or call waiting and the OP translates the purchase into a request and [0081], lines 16-23, where the OP transfers the request to the network elements), wherein each service request includes an indication of the interconnections of the respective component ([0089], lines 3-8, Fig. 2, and [0090], lines 1-3, where the service request is for a replacement rating, billing engine in order to interface with the clients existing systems for customer care, financials management, order processing and network access. The request includes information on interfacing the new components with legacy components [0090], lines 3-18, or indication of the interconnections for the respective components), thereby causing the sequence of service portions to be performed, such that the desired service to be performed ([0081], lines 16-26, where for example, a customer orders call waiting, and the OP activates the service automatically by contacting the network element)".

Hanagan did not explicitly state: "one or more user defined interconnections".

However, Gangopadhyay disclosed: "one or more user to defined interconnections (Col. 2, lines 15-23 and Fig 3)".

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to combine Hanagan and Gangopadhyay since Hanagan disclosed teachings related to providing a user definable service. Gangopadhyay disclosed a method for a user to define a service.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the customer care and billing system of Hanagan with the teachings of Gangopadhyay to include support for user defined interconnections of components. Motivation to combine these references comes preserving modularity, by allowing a user to define connections and keep existing components when desired (for example see Hanagan, [0089], lines 3-8). Therefore, by combining the references, a user can choose to keep satisfactory components and define the interconnections between legacy components and new components as desired.

27. With respect to Claim 25, the combination of Hanagan and Gangopadhyay disclosed: "A system according to claim 24, the system including a base station coupled to one or more end stations via a communications network (Hanagan, [0181], lines 1-3, where the base station is the CCM, the end stations are the kiosks or remote access users)".

28. With respect to Claim 27, Hanagan disclosed: "A method of allowing users to manipulate data ([0181], lines 11-13, where adding new adding new product and services is manipulating the account data for the user), the method including:

a) Providing details of a plurality of components ([0181], lines 10-13 and Fig 12, where details of components include the number of peak and off peak minutes provided by a mobile component), each component representing a respective service portion implemented by a respective entity ([0181], lines 10-16 and Fig 12, where the components, mobile, landline, internet service represents a respective service, wireless phone, wired phone, internet service);

b) Allowing users to define a component combination defining a sequence of service portions ([0181], lines 10-16 and Fig 12, where the user has selected mobile, landline and internet service as a combination) and one or more interconnections between at least some of the components defining transfer of data between the entities of the respective components ([0054], lines 4-8, where components are modular and can integrated into a system where they work together and [0087], lines 1-13, where data transfer between components is defined); and,

c) Causing the service portions to be implemented in accordance with the defined combination ([0181], lines 10-16 and Fig 12, where the defined combination of components provides implemented service portions) wherein each service request includes an indication of the interconnections of the respective component ([0089], lines 3-8, Fig. 2, and [0090], lines 1-3, where the service request is for a replacement rating, billing engine in order to interface with the clients existing systems for customer care,

financials management, order processing and network access. The request includes information on interfacing the new components with legacy components [0090], lines 3-18, or indication of the interconnections for the respective components)".

Hanagan did not explicitly state: "one or more user defined interconnections".

However, Gangopadhyay disclosed: "one or more user to defined interconnections (Col. 2, lines 15-23 and Fig 3)".

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to combine Hanagan and Gangopadhyay since Hanagan disclosed teachings related to providing a user definable service. Gangopadhyay disclosed a method for a user to define a service.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the customer care and billing system of Hanagan with the teachings of Gangopadhyay to include support for user defined interconnections of components. Motivation to combine these references comes preserving modularity, by allowing a user to define connections and keep existing components when desired (for example see Hanagan, [0089], lines 3-8). Therefore, by combining the references, a user can choose to keep satisfactory components and define the interconnections between legacy components and new components as desired.

29. With respect to Claim 28, the combination of Hanagan and Gangopadhyay

disclosed: "A method according to claim 27, the method including: a) For each component, receive a component specification from a respective entity ([0185], lines 6-9, where a product manager provides component specification); and, b) Provide details of one or more components to the user in response to a request (Hanagan, [0196], lines 19-21, where the customer requests billing information and is provided the answer), thereby allowing the user to request implementation of the one or more components, the details being determined from the specification (Hanagan, [0081], lines 16-23, where a customer requests a new product and that product is activated, or implemented, and [0050], lines 9-11, where a bill is created for the services used by the customer)".

30. With respect to Claim 29, the combination of Hanagan and Gangopadhyay disclosed: "A method according to claim 27, the method including causing the processing system to: a) Determine performance information (Hanagan, [0196], lines 16-21, where performance information is pricing information), the performance information being representative of one or more criteria regarding the implementation of the components (Hanagan, [0196], lines 16-21, where pricing information includes cost of implementing the services or components); b) Provide the performance information to a user, the user selecting the components in accordance with the performance information (Hanagan, [0196], lines 19-21, where the customer requests billing information and is provided the answer, and a customer selects components based on pricing information)".

31. With respect to Claim 30, the combination of Hanagan and Gangopadhyay disclosed: "A method according to claim 29, the performance information including at least one of. a) An indication of the entity implementing the component; b) An indication of the geographical location of the entity; c) An indication of the duration for implementing the component; d) An indication of a cost associated with implementing the respective component; and, e) A rating, the rating being indicative of the success of the component (Hanagan, [0196], lines 16-21, where price information is the cost associated with implementing the respective component)".

32. With respect to Claim 32, Hanagan disclosed: "Apparatus for allowing users to manipulate data, the apparatus including a processing system (Abstract, lines 1-3) adapted to:

a) Provide access to one or more components, each component representing a respective service portion performed by a respective entity for manipulating data ([0054], lines 1-8);

b) Allow user to define a combination of the components ([0051], lines 1-10)", "the one or more interconnections representing transfer of data between the entities of the respective components to perform the service ([0054], lines 4-8, where components are modular and can integrated into a system where they work together and [0087], lines 1-13, where data transfer between components is defined); and,

c) Cause the components to manipulate data in accordance with the defined combination ([0081], lines 23-26, where the network element fulfills the request and responds with a success to the OP), wherein a service request is transferred to each entity requesting the respective service portion to be performed ([0081], lines 16-23, where a customer purchases a new phone line or call waiting and the OP translates the purchase into a request and [0081], lines 16-23, where the OP transfers the request to the network elements), wherein each service request includes an indication of the interconnections of the respective component ([0089], lines 3-8, Fig. 2, and [0090], lines 1-3, where the service request is for a replacement rating, billing engine in order to interface with the clients existing systems for customer care, financials management, order processing and network access. The request includes information on interfacing the new components with legacy components [0090], lines 3-18, or indication of the interconnections for the respective components)".

Hanagan did not explicitly state: "wherein the user defines one or more interconnections between at least some of the components".

However, Gangopadhyay disclosed: "wherein the user defines one or more interconnections between at least some of the components (Col. 2, lines 15-23 and Fig 3)".

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to combine Hanagan and Gangopadhyay since Hanagan disclosed teachings

related to providing a user definable service. Gangopadhyay disclosed a method for a user to define a service.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the customer care and billing system of Hanagan with the teachings of Gangopadhyay to include support for user defined interconnections of components. Motivation to combine these references comes preserving modularity, by allowing a user to define connections and keep existing components when desired (for example see Hanagan, [0089], lines 3-8). Therefore, by combining the references, a user can choose to keep satisfactory components and define the interconnections between legacy components and new components as desired.

33. With respect to Claim 35, Hanagan disclosed: "A method of providing a component embodying a service portion using a processing system (Abstract, lines 1-3), the service portion being performed by an entity ([0087], lines 1-5) the method including:

a) Determining a service portion to be performed ([0089], lines 3-8, where the service portion to be performed is implement a new rating and billing engine);

b) Determining a method of performing the service portion ([0090], lines 1-3, where the service is performed by integrating the new components with the legacy components); and,

c) Generating a component specification defining the service portion ([0087], lines 12-13, where interfaces are specifications), the component specification including

port specifications defining any information to be received or output from the respective port ([0087], lines 9-12, where the specification is the standardized interface)

d) Receiving a service request to perform the service portion ([0081], lines 16-23, where a customer purchases a new phone line or call waiting and the OP translates the purchase into a request and [0081], lines 16-23, where the OP transfers the request to the network elements), wherein the service request includes an indication of interconnections of the component with one or more other components of a combination of components to perform a service ([0089], lines 3-8, Fig. 2, and [0090], lines 1-3, where the service request is for a replacement rating, billing engine in order to interface with the clients existing systems for customer care, financials management, order processing and network access. The request includes information on interfacing the new components with legacy components [0090], lines 3-18, or indication of the interconnections for the respective components), wherein the one or more interconnections define transfer of data between entities of the respective components to perform the service ([0054], lines 4-8, where components are modular and can be integrated into a system where they work together and [0087], lines 1-13, where data transfer between components is defined); and

e) Performing the service portion in accordance with the service request ([0081], lines 16-26, where for example, a customer orders call waiting, and the OP activates the service automatically by contacting the network element)".

Hanagan did not explicitly state: "user defined interconnections of the component with one or more other components".

However, Gangopadhyay disclosed: "user defined interconnections of the component with one or more other components (Col. 2, lines 15-23 and Fig 3)".

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to combine Hanagan and Gangopadhyay since Hanagan disclosed teachings related to providing a user definable service. Gangopadhyay disclosed a method for a user to define a service.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the customer care and billing system of Hanagan with the teachings of Gangopadhyay to include support for user defined interconnections of components. Motivation to combine these references comes preserving modularity, by allowing a user to define connections and keep existing components when desired (for example see Hanagan, [0089], lines 3-8). Therefore, by combining the references, a user can choose to keep satisfactory components and define the interconnections between legacy components and new components as desired.

34. With respect to Claim 36, the combination of Hanagan and Gangopadhyay disclosed: "A method according to claim 35, the method including further determining a private component specification defining the method of performing the service portion (Hanagan, [0081], lines 4-9, where the OP determines a private specification defining

the method of performing the service, including tasks and resources required and scheduling, and this is private from the client making the request)".

35. With respect to Claim 37, the combination of Hanagan and Gangopadhyay disclosed: "A method according to claim 35, the method including providing the component specification to a processing system (Hanagan, [0186], lines 1-4, where a catalog is the specification), the processing system being adapted to provide details of the component to users thereby allowing users to select the component for use (Hanagan, [0196], lines 16-21, where details of the component include price information)".

36. With respect to Claim 38, the combination of Hanagan and Gangopadhyay disclosed: "A method according to claim 35, the method including defining a component server to be implemented by the processing system (Hanagan, [0081], lines 1-3, where the OP is a component server), the component server being adapted to generate component instances performing the service portion (Hanagan, [0081], lines 16-26, where the OP generates low level activation request for the network element to implement the service ordered)".

37. With respect to Claim 39, Hanagan disclosed: "Apparatus for providing a component embodying a service portion using a processing system (Abstract, lines 1-3), apparatus including a processing system adapted to: a) Determine in accordance

with user input commands ([0089], lines 3-8, where user input commands is a client request):

i) A service portion to be performed ([0089], lines 3-8, where the service portion to be performed is implement a new rating and billing engine);

ii) A method of performing the service portion ([0090], lines 1-3, where the service is performed by integrating the new components with the legacy components); and,

iii) Generate a component specification defining the service portion ([0087], lines 12-13, where interfaces are specifications), the component specification including port specifications defining any data to be received or output from the ports ([0087], lines 9-12, where the specification is the standardized interface);

iv) Receiving a service request to perform the service portion ([0081], lines 16-23, where a customer purchases a new phone line or call waiting and the OP translates the purchase into a request and [0081], lines 16-23, where the OP transfers the request to the network elements), wherein the service request includes an indication of interconnections of the component with one or more other components of a combination of components to perform a service ([0089], lines 3-8, Fig. 2, and [0090], lines 1-3, where the service request is for a replacement rating, billing engine in order to interface with the clients existing systems for customer care, financials management, order processing and network access. The request includes information on interfacing the new components with legacy components [0090], lines 3-18, or indication of the interconnections for the respective components), wherein the one or more

interconnections define transfer of data between entities of the respective components to perform the service ([0054], lines 4-8, where components are modular and can be integrated into a system where they work together and [0087], lines 1-13, where data transfer between components is defined); and

v) Performing the service portion in accordance with the service request ([0081], lines 16-26, where for example, a customer orders call waiting, and the OP activates the service automatically by contacting the network element)".

Hanagan did not explicitly state: "user defined interconnections of the component with one or more other components".

However, Gangopadhyay disclosed: "user defined interconnections of the component with one or more other components (Col. 2, lines 15-23 and Fig 3)".

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to combine Hanagan and Gangopadhyay since Hanagan disclosed teachings related to providing a user definable service. Gangopadhyay disclosed a method for a user to define a service.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the customer care and billing system of Hanagan with the teachings of Gangopadhyay to include support for user defined interconnections of components. Motivation to combine these references comes preserving modularity, by allowing a user to define connections and keep existing components when desired (for

example see Hanagan, [0089], lines 3-8). Therefore, by combining the references, a user can choose to keep satisfactory components and define the interconnections between legacy components and new components as desired.

38. With respect to Claim 42, Hanagan disclosed: "A method of providing a service portion embodied in a component using a processing system (Abstract, lines 1-3), the method including causing the processing system to:

a) Receive a service request ([0089], lines 3-8), wherein the service request includes an indication of interconnections of the component with one or more other components of a combination of components to perform a service ([0089], lines 3-8, Fig. 2, and [0090], lines 1-3, where the service request is for a replacement rating, billing engine in order to interface with the clients existing systems for customer care, financials management, order processing and network access. The request includes information on interfacing the new components with legacy components [0090], lines 3-18, or indication of the interconnections for the respective components), wherein the one or more interconnections define transfer of data between entities of the respective components to perform the service ([0054], lines 4-8, where components are modular and can integrated into a system where they work together and [0087], lines 1-13, where data transfer between components is defined);

b) Generate a respective component instance in response to the received service request ([0090], lines 1-3, where generated component instances are used to fulfill the request and provide new ERP, CBM and PSM components);

c) Obtain any required information ([0089], lines 1-3, where information obtained includes which new components to implement and which legacy components will remain); and,

d) Perform the service portion in accordance with the service request ([0090], lines 1-3, where the new components are integrated with the legacy components to fulfill the request)".

Hanagan did not explicitly state: "user defined interconnections of the component with one or more other components".

However, Gangopadhyay disclosed: "user defined interconnections of the component with one or more other components (Col. 2, lines 15-23 and Fig 3)".

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to combine Hanagan and Gangopadhyay since Hanagan disclosed teachings related to providing a user definable service. Gangopadhyay disclosed a method for a user to define a service.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the customer care and billing system of Hanagan with the teachings of Gangopadhyay to include support for user defined interconnections of components. Motivation to combine these references comes preserving modularity, by allowing a user to define connections and keep existing components when desired (for example see Hanagan, [0089], lines 3-8). Therefore, by combining the references, a

user can choose to keep satisfactory components and define the interconnections between legacy components and new components as desired.

39. With respect to Claim 43, the combination of Hanagan and Gangopadhyay disclosed: "A method according to claim 42, the method including causing the processing system to perform the service portion using at least one of." a) A predetermined process; and, b) Input commands received from an operator (Hanagan, [0081], lines 26-32, where automatic activation of a service is not possible and an operator or workforce intervention is required)".

40. With respect to Claim 44, Hanagan disclosed: "Apparatus for method providing a service portion embodied in a component (Abstract, lines 1-3), the apparatus including a processing system adapted to:

a) Receive a service request ([0089], lines 3-8), wherein the service request includes an indication of interconnections of the component with one or more other components of a combination of components to perform a service ([0089], lines 3-8, Fig. 2, and [0090], lines 1-3, where the service request is for a replacement rating, billing engine in order to interface with the clients existing systems for customer care, financials management, order processing and network access. The request includes information on interfacing the new components with legacy components [0090], lines 3-18, or indication of the interconnections for the respective components), wherein the one or more interconnections define transfer of data between entities of the respective

components to perform the service ([0054], lines 4-8, where components are modular and can be integrated into a system where they work together and [0087], lines 1-13, where data transfer between components is defined);

b) Generate a respective component instance in response to the received service request ([0090], lines 1-3, where generated component instances are used to fulfill the request and provide new ERP, CBM and PSM components);

c) Obtain any required information ([0089], lines 1-3, where information obtained includes which new components to implement and which legacy components will remain); and,

d) Perform the service portion in accordance with the service request ([0090], lines 1-3, where the new components are integrated with the legacy components to fulfill the request)".

Hanagan did not explicitly state: "user defined interconnections of the component with one or more other components".

However, Gangopadhyay disclosed: "user defined interconnections of the component with one or more other components (Col. 2, lines 15-23 and Fig 3)".

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to combine Hanagan and Gangopadhyay since Hanagan disclosed teachings related to providing a user definable service. Gangopadhyay disclosed a method for a user to define a service.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the customer care and billing system of Hanagan with the teachings of Gangopadhyay to include support for user defined interconnections of components. Motivation to combine these references comes preserving modularity, by allowing a user to define connections and keep existing components when desired (for example see Hanagan, [0089], lines 3-8). Therefore, by combining the references, a user can choose to keep satisfactory components and define the interconnections between legacy components and new components as desired.

41. With respect to Claim 47, the combination of Hanagan and Gangopadhyay disclosed: "A method according to claim 16, wherein the each agent negotiates with the agent of another component in accordance with the defined interconnections to thereby allow data to be transferred between the ports (Hanagan, [0087], lines 1-13, where standardized interfaces, or agents, are provided for each component and allow modularity by including all the information that is needed by the sending and receiving system)".

42. Claims 21 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanagan and Gangopadhyay in view of Rigole (US 7,139,728 B2).

43. With respect to Claims 21 and 31, the combination of Hanagan and Gangopadhyay did not explicitly state: "A method according to claim 19, the method

including: Providing a number of different components for performing equivalent service portions, the different components being provided by different entities so that the user selects one of the components provided by one of the different entities in accordance with the performance information".

However, Rigole disclosed: "the method including: Providing a number of different components for performing equivalent service portions (Col. 3, lines 35-36, where there are a number of different service providers providing equivalent service portions, such as long distance telephone), the different components being provided by different entities (Col. 3, lines 35-39, the service providers being different entities) so that the user selects one of the components provided by one of the different entities in accordance with the performance information (Col. 3, lines 39-46)".

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to combine Hanagan and Gangopadhyay with Rigole since Hanagan and Gangopadhyay disclosed teachings related to providing a user definable service. Rigole disclosed a system to provide services to a customer.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the customer care and billing system of Hanagan and Gangopadhyay with the teachings of Rigole to include support for allowing customers to view equivalent services provided by different entities. Motivation to combine these references comes from Rigole, where: "the consumer can use a criteria feature to list the services in order of preference based upon one or more selected characteristics,

such as price or service level. The consumer can then select a particular service provider and review pertinent service information" (Col. 3, lines 39-43). Therefore by combining the references one can easily compare services based on characteristics such as price in order to make a more informed decision.

Response to Arguments

44. Applicant's arguments, filed April 9 2009, see pg 13, 35 USC 102 Rejections, have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

45. Applicant's further arguments, filed April 9 2009, see pg 14 – pg 17, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

46. Applicant argues: "the Applicant notes that portions of Hanagan et al lead away from combination with Gangopadhyay et al" (pg 15, lines 8-9).

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant specifically argues that in Hanagan the service determines independently of the user the combination of resources needed to complete the request. Contrary to applicants' assertion, the user of Hanagan can choose the components needed to complete the request. See for example, [0089], where the user only wants to implement a rating engine and bill generation process, while maintaining their existing customer care, financials management, order processing, and network access systems. In such a situation the user chooses which

components to upgrade and which components to keep. Furthermore, Hanagan disclosed the modularity of the system components at [0087] illustrating the components can be implemented as a total solution, individually or in some combination. Therefore Hanagan disclosed how a user defines the components used for a service to be performed. Gangopadhyay disclosed similar teachings, including allowing the user to define components used and their connections for a service to be performed. Thus, a combination with Gangopadhyay is relevant and Hanagan does not lead away from the combination.

47. Applicant further argues: "the implementation of the components by the component processing systems has not been shown by above mentioned citations, and in particular Hanagan et al which shows a single processing system having a number of implemented components" (pg 16, lines 20-23).

Examiner respectfully disagrees. The claim language recites: "the components being implemented by component processing systems" (Claim 12, lines 1-2). Each component of Hanagan can function independently and therefore is a component processing system in itself, see for example, Hanagan [0054], specifically: "The components are independent and integrated containing all the necessary processes and inputs and outputs to function independently". Therefore, each component is implemented by a component processing system because it can function independently. Hanagan does go on to state that components can be integrated into a system where

the components work together, however this does not change the independent nature of each component.

48. Applicant further argues: "Applicant notes that there is insufficient disclosure teaching or suggestion of the subject matter of claim 16" (pg 17, lines 1-2).

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant specifically argues: "The standardized interface of Hanagan et al does not cooperate with another interface of another interface based on the description of Hanagan" (pg 17, lines 11-13). While this argument does not make sense, it is assumed that applicant intended to argue: "The standardized interface of Hanagan et al does not cooperate with another interface of another component based on the description of Hanagan". However, Hanagan disclosed a standardized interface, or agent, for each component to allow each component to communicate in accordance with the defined interconnections to another component, see [0087]. Specifically: "standardized interfaces are provided for each component, where the interface includes all the information that is needed by the sending and receiving system" ([0087], lines 9-12). Therefore, by implementing a number of components, each with a standardized interface which includes all the information needed by the sending and receiving system, whenever the components communicate the standardized interfaces of each component are cooperating to allow data to be transferred.

Conclusion

49. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MATTHEW S. LINDSEY whose telephone number is (571)270-3811. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 7-5, Fridays 7-12.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone

Art Unit: 2451

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MSL

6/30/2009

/John Follansbee/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2451